

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of August 20, 2007 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 14 - 26 have been examined. These have been rejected as follows: claims 23 and 25 as indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph because of the recitation in these claims of the phrase "for example;" claim 14 as anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Wischinski; claim 15 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Wischinski; claim 16 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Wischinski in view of Jurisch et al; claim 17 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Wischinski in view of Jurisch et al and Aisenberg et al; claims 18 and 26 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Wischinski in view of Havekost et al; claim 19 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Wischinski in view of Havekost et al and APA; claims 20, 21 and 25 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Wischinski in view of APA; and claims 22 - 24 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Wischinski in view of APA and Havekost et al.

These rejections have been carefully considered and claim 14 amended to include the subject matter of claim 20. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 14 - 19 are rendered moot. There remains the rejection under 35 USC 112, and the art rejections of claims 20 - 26. The noted remaining art rejections are respectfully traversed.

As to the rejection under 35 USC 112, claims 23 and 25 have been amended to remove the "e.g..." phrase. These have been placed in new claims 27 and 28. As to the rejections of claims 20 - 26, please consider the following:

WO 01/90829 (Wischinski) discloses a system for remote configuration monitoring of an industrial control system. On page 2, paragraph 2 of Wischinski it is described that the system includes a device identifier for determining components of predetermined automation or control devices indicated in a device database by periodically querying the devices to have

each device indicate its components hardware, software and firmware. By comparison of the available device components with the components stored in the data base it becomes possible to provide an offer to upgrade installed device components. This is done by a device configuration manager.

Additionally Wischinski describes a system diagnostics manager, responsive to the component identification in the device data base and further responsive to diagnostics information in the database of end user system diagnostics.

It is respectfully submitted that Wischinski does not disclose a method for monitoring a field device by preventing unauthorized tampering with the field device as it is described in amended claim 14.

U.S. Patent 7,072,987 B2 (Jurisch) discloses a method for operating and observing a proxy server device connected to a field device. The proxy server device can be connected to the field device and a user device in order to respectively exchange electronic data in order to monitor and/or operate the field device. The electronic data consists of static data which is transmitted according to a first protocol standard and dynamic data which is transmitted according to a second protocol standard. Jurisch is not appropriate to render the present invention obvious when combined with Wischinski, because neither reference contains a teaching, at least, of the alarm now included in claim 14.

U.S. Patent 6,774,786 B1 (Havekost et al.) refers to an alarm display and interface tool for use in a process control system that receives and displays different categories of alarms, for example device alarms and hardware alarms as well as traditional process alarms on a single display. The solution disclosed in Havekost et al. refers to the so-called "Condition

Monitoring" where deficiencies In the process or in the field devices are detected. An alarm is set when a deficiency occurs. This reference is not appropriate, it is respectfully submitted, either alone or in combination with the other references to lead a person skilled in the art to the subject-matter of amended claim 14 even though it teaches an alarm because the teaching has nothing to do with unauthorized tampering (amended claim 14).

It is not seen how the "APA" found on "page 3, lines 9 - 12 of the specification" can render claim 20 (claim 4 as now amended) unpatentable when combined with Wischinski since neither the passage quoted nor Wischinski teach the use of an alarm when the identifier has changed.

Regarding claim 26, the specific references to the disclosure in Havekost et al have been considered but applicants cannot agree that this disclosure teaches storing data in response to a direct query in the event no answer is received. As noted above, Havekost et al is specific to different alarms not to a field device that has been queried. Claim 26 does not involve identifying different alarms but in monitoring a field device. Incidental similarities do not justify a conclusion of obviousness.

A new page 1 of the declaration bearing the signature and address of Mr. Vincent DE GROOT is being submitted herewith as requested by the examiner. A REPLACEMENT SHEET of the drawing is also being submitted herewith as requested by the examiner. In addition, a new abstract and amendments to the specification have been submitted in accordance with the examiner's discussion. Finally, the objection to claims 21 - 26 is noted. The appropriate claims have been amended to overcome this objection.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested and claims 14 - 19 and 21 - 26 found allowable.

Date: Nov. 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC


Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number 25,721

Customer Number *23364*
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\fjd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\DEGR3003-PS0019\Response Nov 20, 2007.wpd